# Planning Commission Public Meeting Lewis County Courthouse 351 NW North St. Chehalis, WA 98532

# July 27, 2010 Meeting Notes

Planning Commissioners Present: Bill Russell, Mike Mahoney, Bob Guenther, Jim Lowery, Rachael

**Jennings** 

**Planning Commissioners Excused:** Arny Davis, Richard Tausch **Staff Present:** Phil Rupp, Barbara Kincaid, Pat Anderson

Others Present: Please see sign in sheet

## **Handouts/Materials Used:**

Agenda

- Meeting Notes from July 13, 2010
- Matrix of Rezone Comments
- Rezone Maps 9, 10, 11

### I. Call to Order

Chairman Jennings called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm. The Commissioners introduced themselves.

### **II. Old Business**

A. Approval of the meeting notes from July 13, 2010.

Chairman Jennings entertained a motion to approve the meeting notes. Commissioner Russell made the motion; Commissioner Lowery seconded. Motion carried.

B. Workshop on Rezones Requests for East of I-5, North of the Cowlitz River and South of Hwy 12 Mr. Rupp stated on page 25 of the matrix the application number and map number have been reversed.

### Application #163, Map 9

The request is to change from RDD20 to Commercial. There are two parcels, both in timber. The existing pattern of development and uses is rural in character. A change to a more intensive non-rural designation would be contrary to the GMA and the policies and principles of the Lewis County comp plan. Critical areas include wetlands and hydric soils.

Consideration may be given to a more intense use such as RDD-10 due to the development pattern that is evident. RDD-10 would provide flexibility for some limited commercial development, and there is RDD-10 immediately east of this property.

Commissioner Russell stated because of the county's building codes and the critical areas RDD-10 would be an acceptable zoning.

### Application #170, Map 11

This request is from ARL to RDD-20. The land was designated ARL in 2008 and is part of a larger block of approximately 2000 acres. It does not appear that an error was made in the ARL designation nor have

LC Planning Commission Meeting Notes 7.27.10 Page 2 of 4

conditions changed to warrant a change in zoning. A change to a designation other than ARL would create a spot zone.

Commissioner Mahoney recognized that a lot of the parcels in this area are small but he could not justify a spot zone in the middle of the large ARL block.

### Application #77, Map 11

This rezone request is from RDD-20 to RDD-5. It is approximately 152 acres involving 13 parcels and 9 applicants. A 71-acre parcel was designated ARL in 2008 and it meets all the ARL criteria. The other 81 acres are currently zoned RDD-10. These parcels have critical areas that include wetlands and hydric soils. 7 lots have homes and the rest are undeveloped except for 28 acres that is being farmed. Rezoning this 81 acre area would create a spot zone.

Commissioner Mahoney asked if changing the zoning to RDD-5 would have any affect or benefit for the property owners. With the exception of the one piece they could not subdivide.

Mr. Rupp stated many of these applications were generated by an individual that included signatures of property owners around him that did not necessarily want a zone change but were supportive of the requested change. The principle of spot zoning could be applied here.

Commissioner Mahoney asked if the owner of the larger parcel to the north of the wrecking yard wanted some activity connected in any way to the wrecking yard would the zoning allow that. Mr. Rupp stated no because that is a LAMIRD and a LAMIRD cannot be expanded unless an error was made or it can be proved that it had previous development that is consistent with the LAMIRD.

### Application #130, Map 11

This was a 2002 application to change from RDD-20 to RDD-10. The land was rezoned ARL in 2008. It does not appear that an error was made in the ARL designation and conditions have not changed to warrant changing the zoning. It is also part of a larger ARL block; changing the zoning would create a spot zone.

Commissioner Russell stated the land is currently being used for agriculture.

### Application #99, Map 10

This request is to change from RDD-5 to STMU (small town mixed use). It consists of 40 acres and is currently zoned ARL. It does not appear that an error was made in this designation. Also, the STMU designation only applies to those areas designated by the county as a LAMIRD.

Commissioner Mahoney stated there are several small concentrations of rural towns, such as Salkum. Can none of those towns ever expand? Mr. Rupp stated they can be expanded if they can show that the original boundary was made in error and did not include some more intensive use. A good example is the Curtis Rail Yard. The County tried to expand that LAMIRD because the pole yard went outside the existing boundaries of the LAMIRD but the Growth Board said we did not have a case. There is an extensive process and it must show the need to expand and the ability to service that additional land.

## Application #79, Map 11

This request is from RDD-20 to RDD-5. It is currently being used for agriculture and includes wetlands and hydric soils; there is a stream on the property. To the south and southwest is a block of ARL and the surrounding property is RDD-20 and rezoning this parcel to RDD-5 would create a spot zone.

# Application #144, Map 11

This 2001 application was to change from Class A agriculture to an unspecified RDD zone on approximately 183 acres. In 2008 the area was designated ARL and there is no evidence that an error was made.

# Application #116, Map 11

This 2002 application was to change from RDD-20 to RDD-10 on approximately 300 acres. In 2008 180 acres north of Howe Rd. E was designated ARL; the remainder of the area is RDD-10. No further consideration is needed on this portion.

The 180 acres of ARL consists of large parcels, contain prime soils and are used for agricultural activity and timber production. There is no evidence that an ARL designation was made in error.

# Application #58, Map 11

This 2002 application is to change approximately 131 acres from RDD-10 to RDD-5. In 2008 approximately 80 acres were designated ARL. The remaining 53 acres is currently zoned RDD-10.

The 80 acres meets ARL criteria. The 53 acres along the Cowlitz River contain critical areas including wetlands, hydric soils, geo hazards, sensitive aquifer recharge, flooding, and shoreline jurisdiction. Changing this to RDD-5 would constitute a spot zone.

## Application #109, Map 11

This 2002 application is to rezone about 100 acres from RDD-10 to RDD-5. It was zoned ARL in 2008. On July 20, 2010, on behalf of the applicant, Cairncross and Hemplemann submitted a letter regarding this application. Because the subject parcels are included in the South County Subarea Plan the property owner wishes to pursue this request consistent with the proposed Subarea Plan. The parcels are included in a proposed expanded Toledo UGA and the applicant supports the Toledo UGA proposal and Subarea Plan proposals.

### Application # 111 and #59, Map 11

This request is from RDD-20 to RDD-5. There are two applications and separate owners. Both properties are used to grow timber and enrolled in the open space timber tax program. There are critical areas on the parcels.

These parcels are included in the South County Subarea planning area. They are located between two proposed UGAs in the draft Subarea plan. Consideration and recommendation for these parcels must be consistent with the proposed Subarea Plan.

Commissioner Lowery asked if this comes to public hearing and there is a decision not to change it now, how does that impact the subarea plan.

Mr. Rupp stated it leaves a cleaner slate for the subarea plan process to designate an appropriate use consistent with the overall concept for that planning effort.

Commissioner Lowery stated it could come back before the Planning Commission during the subarea plan hearings. Mr. Rupp stated the Planning Commission will see a lot of these properties at that time. Some of them may be included, abutting or adjacent to municipal UGAs. That has not yet been determined.

Commissioner Russell asked if that wouldn't create a spot zone. Mr. Rupp stated it would, and there is also a concern regarding the critical areas when you consider increasing the density.

Applications 106, 64, 107, 108, 110, Map 11

On July 20, 2010, on behalf of the applicant, Cairncross and Hemplemann submitted a letter regarding these applications. Because the subject parcels are included in the South County Subarea Plan the property owners wishes to pursue this request consistent with the proposed Subarea Plan. Therefore, the applicants have requested to revise their original requests.

The applicants request removal of Application #106 from rezone consideration to leave the existing RDD-20 zoning. They ask that four parcels in #64 and #107 be included in the SR 505-Jackson Hwy subarea UGA. The 3 parcels in #107 are already zoned RDD-5 and no further action is needed.

Applications 108 and 110 are located at Sareault Rd. and Jackson Hwy. The applicants have asked to include only parcels 11367 and 11368-2. Current zoning on the rest of the parcels would remain.

The scaled back request would change parcel 11368-2 from RDD-20 to RDD-5 and would complete the RDD-5 zoning on a split zoned parcel (11367) on a total of 56 acres along Sareault Rd.

Many of the parcels on Sareault Rd. are zoned RDD-5. This would create consistent zoning along Sareault Rd. The surrounding pattern of use is rural residential on 5-10 acre lots and agricultural activities. Critical areas include wetland and hydric soils.

#### III. Calendar

The next meeting will be on August 10 to workshop the rezone requests south of the Cowlitz River on maps 10, 11, 12 and 13.

Mr. Rupp stated planning staff will be working on a schedule for the Planning Commission hearings. Commissioner Mahoney asked if there would be a hearing scheduled for East County. Mr. Rupp stated that is a decision of the Commission; there are very few rezone requests for that area.

# IV. Good of the Order

No one wished to speak.

### V. Adjourn

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 8:02 pm.